

LeClerc Creek Grazing Allotment Management Planning Environmental Assessment

Heritage Program Report
Newport/Sullivan Lake Ranger Districts, Colville National Forest

INTRODUCTION

The Newport-Sullivan Lake Ranger District of the Colville National Forest is undertaking management planning for the LeClerc Creek Grazing allotment on National Forest System (NFS). The analysis area is within the LeClerc subwatershed. Primary access is via Fourth of July (FR 1932), East Branch LeClerc (FR 1934), Middle Branch LeClerc (FR 1935) and West Branch LeClerc (FR 1933) roads (see attached map). The analysis area includes management areas 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11.

The focus of this project is to analyze management of the existing range allotment permit. The purpose of the LeClerc Creek project is:

- Provide protection or enhancement of ecosystem values affected by grazing including streams, fisheries habitat, riparian areas, sensitive plant species, terrestrial wildlife habitats, vegetation, and recreation sites;
- Compliance with Section 504 of the 1995 Rescissions Act (P.L. 104-19). The Act requires that NEPA analysis be conducted on all range allotments by 2019 and that new permits be issued unless there are significant environmental concerns;
- to develop design requirements and mitigations (as needed) to address identified environmental effects
- Analyze whether to continue authorizing grazing in the LeClerc Creek allotment;
- to update allotment management plans to reflect current laws, regulations and management direction and provide for adaptive management; and
- to authorize construction of needed range improvement projects, including fence lines, water developments and related facilities and the redesign of existing range improvement projects.

The current condition will be evaluated against Forest Plan management objectives and desired future conditions as described by the Forest Plan, Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #2, the Inland Native Fish Strategy Environmental Assessment (INFISH EA) (June 1995), and the National Fire Plan. Additional information related to analysis is located in FSH 2209.13, Chapter 90 – grazing permit administration handbook.

Preliminary needs identified for this area include:

- improvement in stream bank condition in some areas;
- forage quantity in the LeClerc Creek allotment;
- reviewing allotment boundaries

A cultural resources literature search was conducted on the proposed project area. Heritage Program staff reviewed archaeological site records and cultural resources survey reports on file at the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) and in the Colville National Forest's Heritage Program reference library.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Overview of Past Human Land Usage in the LeClerc Project Area

First Nation Influence

Ethnographic investigation has permitted certain generalities about the region. During the past 6,000 years, the region has been utilized by diverse groups of people for a variety of activities. The project area lies within the traditional use area of the Kalispel Tribe. The Kalispel is a sub-group of the Salishan speaking groups which include the following cultural traditions: Wenatchee, Columbia, Chelan, Methow, Okanogan, Nespelem, Sanpoil, Spokane, Coeur D'Alene, Colville, Lakes and Kalispel. Ethnographic accounts indicate that the Pend Oreille River Valley, specifically, the eastern edge of Colville National Forest may have also been utilized by the Kootenai, Spokane and Colville tribes (Kennedy and Bouchard 1998, Lahren 1998). Native people of the region ranged freely over the hills and valleys hunting and gathering. Compared with many other areas of the Pacific Northwest, the numbers of native peoples living in Pend Oreille County were relatively small. Ethnographic accounts indicate that the Kalispel practiced wintertime deer drives and maintained resident fisheries along the Pend Oreille River. In addition to hunting deer and fishing, the Kalispel harvested camas (*Camassia* sp) (Lahren 1998). *Native American cultural resource sites (on National Forest System lands) have been identified within the Area of Potential Effect.*

Euro-American

The project area was largely unoccupied by non-Native Americans until the turn of the century. The early 1900s was a period of settlement and development of lumber, mining and agriculture industries.

Beginning in 1821, the Hudson Bay Trading Company had great influence in the Colville and Pend Oreille Valley regions; this influence lasted through to the late 1800s. The Hudson Bay Trading Company was the largest trade outpost in the region serving parts of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Canada. The company also maintained a cadre of trappers as well as purchasing furs from free-lance trappers. Under the influence/guidance of the Hudson Bay Trading Company, many trails were created to facilitate trade within the region. The presence of the Hudson Bay Trading Company induced cultural changes in both Euro-American and First Nation Communities alike (Chance 1973). In 1809, David Thompson of the North West Company was the first trader to make contact with the Kalispel (Thoms 1987b). Thompson traded ironworks (knives, awls, guns, etc.) for beaver pelts.

Settlers in the late 1880s introduced the timber industry into the area. With the timber industry and the passage of the Forest Homestead Act in 1906, homesteaders moved into the project area (Bamonte and Bamonte 1996). The Forest Homestead Act allowed for 160-acre homesteads on reserved forest lands. Under the Act the land parcels were supposed to have agricultural potential, but much of the land was rocky and unsuitable for farming. Settlers in the area found that timber harvest was much more profitable than farming (Bamonte and Bamonte 1996).

The timber industry became the primary industry and contributed greatly to the settlement and economic development of Pend Oreille County (Fandrich 2002). By the 1920s there were two primary companies that owned and operated sawmills in the Le Clerc Creek drainage: Diamond Match and Panhandle Lumber Companies. These two companies competed for the available timber in the Le Clerc creek drainage, building many roads, flumes, railroads, and lumber camps - including the former town site "Diamond City".

Existing Conditions: Historic Properties

There are forty-six identified historic properties within the proposed planning area. Two sites (6210500296 and 6210500300) have been determined not eligible for inclusion in the National Register for Historic Places (NRHP). The remaining forty-four sites have not been evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP. Because past management practices have not evaluated these properties for eligibility to the NRHP; unevaluated historic properties are managed as if eligible and mitigations for these properties will follow management prescriptions as specified in the next section. Currently the Heritage Program management attempts to relocate sites, monitor the sites for damage/deterioration, evaluate the sites for NRHP eligibility, and preserve/protect the sites.

TRIBAL CONCERNS

In 1993, the Kalispel Tribe of Indians notified the Colville National Forest via written correspondence of traditional cultural properties (TCPs) that were located in the LeClerc drainage (482 acres located in the northernmost portion of the allotment). The letter briefed the Forest on the Tribes' intent to nominate those lands for listing with the National Register of Historic Places. Through the years, the Tribes have consistently provided comments to the Forest regarding their interest and concern for activities occurring on and in the vicinity of identified parcels.

The Kalispel Tribe of Indians contacted the Forest in October 2012 via written correspondence, at the outset of this project; their letter emphasized their concern for these parcels. The tribe indicated that "there has been an increasing reluctance on the part of the Kalispel membership in the use of specific landforms in the existing cattle allotment for the gathering of traditional medicinal plants." Furthermore they believe that there is an incompatibility between free exercise of traditional beliefs, curative arts, and rites of passage and cattle grazing. Statements to this affect have been made at meetings with the Forest (February 19, 2013).

MANAGEMENT CLASS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR HISTORIC PROPERTIES

A NRHP determination of eligibility is prescribed by the National Historic Preservation Act implementing regulations at 36CFR800 as the method for designing management recommendations for historic properties located on National Forest System lands. Evaluations of eligibility are performed for each property within the project boundary, when practical. Following this, management prescriptions are provided for project analysis. The following list of management prescriptions was developed for historic properties on National Forest System lands. These prescriptions are based on National Register eligibility determinations for historic properties.

Management Class Prescriptions

Management Class	Prescription
1	Evaluated as Not Eligible. No further need to actively manage.
2	Not Evaluated. Property must be protected and preserved as if eligible. Protect historic property through avoidance.
3	Evaluated as Eligible to the National Register. Project will have No Effect on property. Property must be protected and preserved as defined by Regulation. Protect historic property through avoidance.
4	Evaluated as Eligible. Project will have an Adverse Effect on property. Property must be protected and preserved as defined by Regulation. Protect historic property through avoidance.

EFFECTS

ALTERNATIVE A, NO CHANGE

Heritage Properties:

The following heritage sites have the potential to be impacted under alternative A:

Site Number	Eligibility Determination	Site Number	Eligibility Determination
6201300369	Management Class 2	6210500149	Management Class 2
6210500025	Management Class 2	6210500150	Management Class 2
6210500061	Management Class 2	6210500151	Management Class 2
6210500062	Management Class 2	6210500152	Management Class 2
6210500105	Management Class 2	6210500153	Management Class 2
6210500106	Management Class 2	6210500178	Management Class 2
6210500107	Management Class 2	6210500179	Management Class 2
6210500108	Management Class 2	6210500180	Management Class 2
6210500109	Management Class 2	6210500215	Management Class 2
6210500110	Management Class 2	6210500219	Management Class 2
6210500111	Management Class 2	6210500243	Management Class 2
6210500012	Management Class 2	6210500244	Management Class 2
6210500113	Management Class 2	6210500261	Management Class 2
6210500114	Management Class 2	6210500283	Management Class 2
6210500115	Management Class 2	6210500286	Management Class 2
6210500116	Management Class 2	6210500292	Management Class 2
6210500117	Management Class 2	6210500294	Management Class 2
6210500118	Management Class 2	6210500295	Management Class 2

6210500119	Management Class 2	6210500296	Management Class 1
6210500120	Management Class 2	6210500297	Management Class 2
6210500121	Management Class 2	6210500300	Management Class 1
6210500129	Management Class 2	6210500332	Management Class 2
6210500130	Management Class 2	6210500366	Management Class 2

Grazing activities have the potential to damage or destroy these sites directly and indirectly through the movement, concentrations and innate behavior of cattle. When range improvement projects are proposed heritage program personnel will identify sites on the ground and will coordinate with appropriate project personnel to provide location information and additional protection mitigations as needed.

An Adaptive Management Strategy (AMS) is proposed under alternative C, any project/treatment that results from the AMS would be subject to and comply with the NHPA Section 106 to ensure the protection of historic properties and traditional cultural resources.

By following the prescribed design criteria stated in chapter 2, alternative C will have no effect on heritage resources.

Management Class 1 Sites have been evaluated and determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Before any activity occurs at the sites, SHPO will review and need to concur with determinations. Management Class 1 sites will then not need to be actively managed.

Management Class 2 sites must be protected and preserved as if they were eligible for the NRHP. There are two protection options available. Either provisions must be made to avoid direct impacts to the site during the planned activities (e.g. delete or buffer entire unit or a sufficient amount of the unit to avoid impacts to the site) or, if it is determined this is not a viable option, a plan for site evaluation and effects mitigation must be developed and executed by the Forest or District Heritage Program. There are several mitigation options that can be explored including research, interpretation, public education, site enhancement or a combination of these and other options. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurs with these actions.

Tribal Concerns: NEGATIVE EFFECT

The concerns raised by the tribe would continue to be unresolved with regard to grazing permitted within the parcels identified as potentially NRHP eligible TCPs.

ALTERNATIVE B, NO ACTION (No grazing)

Heritage Properties: NO EFFECT

There would be little to no change from the current condition. Heritage sites would continue to gradually deteriorate over time; subject primarily to natural forces (i.e. weather conditions, unexpected wildfire, etc.). Natural forces could destroy or significantly damage standing or downed historical structures, affecting potential National Register eligibility characteristics of these properties.

The effects from cattle grazing would be eliminated which could slow the rate of deterioration in sites that have been affected by cattle.

Tribal Concerns: BENEFICIAL EFFECT

The concerns raised by the tribe with regard to TCPs would be resolved with grazing not being permitted within the parcels identified as potentially NRHP eligible TCPs.

ALTERNATIVE C, PROPOSED ACTION (Adaptive Management)

Heritage Properties: NO EFFECT

The following heritage sites have the potential to be impacted under alternative C:

Site Number	Eligibility Determination	Site Number	Eligibility Determination
6201300369	Management Class 2	6210500149	Management Class 2
6210500025	Management Class 2	6210500150	Management Class 2
6210500061	Management Class 2	6210500151	Management Class 2
6210500062	Management Class 2	6210500152	Management Class 2
6210500105	Management Class 2	6210500153	Management Class 2
6210500106	Management Class 2	6210500178	Management Class 2
6210500107	Management Class 2	6210500179	Management Class 2
6210500108	Management Class 2	6210500180	Management Class 2
6210500109	Management Class 2	6210500215	Management Class 2
6210500110	Management Class 2	6210500219	Management Class 2
6210500111	Management Class 2	6210500243	Management Class 2
6210500012	Management Class 2	6210500244	Management Class 2
6210500113	Management Class 2	6210500261	Management Class 2
6210500114	Management Class 2	6210500283	Management Class 2
6210500115	Management Class 2	6210500286	Management Class 2
6210500116	Management Class 2	6210500292	Management Class 2
6210500117	Management Class 2	6210500294	Management Class 2
6210500118	Management Class 2	6210500295	Management Class 2
6210500119	Management Class 2	6210500296	Management Class 1
6210500120	Management Class 2	6210500297	Management Class 2
6210500121	Management Class 2	6210500300	Management Class 1
6210500129	Management Class 2	6210500332	Management Class 2
6210500130	Management Class 2	6210500366	Management Class 2

Grazing activities have the potential to damage or destroy these sites directly and indirectly through the movement, concentrations and innate behavior of cattle. When range improvement projects or other associated projects (cattle management, riparian habitat restoration/protection/improvement, and wildlife/fisheries habitat protection/improvement) are proposed heritage program personnel will identify sites on the ground and will coordinate with appropriate project personnel to provide location information and additional protection mitigations as needed.

Cattle trailing between pastures would occur on pre-existing roadways. The permittee is reasonably required to keep the cattle within the disturbed road prism

to avoid potential damage to heritage resources (particularly when trailing through Diamond City).

Management Class 1 Sites have been evaluated and determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Before any activity occurs at the sites, SHPO will review and need to concur with determinations. Management Class 1 sites will then not need to be actively managed.

Management Class 2 sites must be protected and preserved as if they were eligible for the NRHP. There are two protection options available. Either provisions must be made to avoid direct impacts to the site during the planned activities (e.g. delete or buffer entire unit or a sufficient amount of the unit to avoid impacts to the site) or, if it is determined this is not a viable option, a plan for site evaluation and effects mitigation must be developed and executed by the Forest or District Heritage Program. There are several mitigation options that can be explored including research, interpretation, public education, site enhancement or a combination of these and other options. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurs with these actions.

An Adaptive Management Strategy (AMS) is proposed under alternatives C, any project/treatment that results from the AMS would be subject to and comply with the NHPA Section 106 to ensure the protection of historic properties and traditional cultural resources.

By following the prescribed design criteria stated in chapter 2, alternative C will have no effect on heritage resources.

Tribal Concerns: BENEFICIAL AFFECT

Boundary modifications were proposed in alternative C to specifically address tribal concerns for areas they had previously identified as Traditional Cultural Properties. Under this alternative, grazing would be excluded from the parcels identified as potentially NRHP eligible TCPs. Tribal concerns would be resolved with under alternative C and could have a beneficial effect on culturally significant resources that had previously been affected by cattle grazing activities

ALTERNATIVE D

Heritage Properties: NO EFFECT

The following heritage sites have the potential to be impacted under alternative D:

Site Number	Eligibility Determination	Site Number	Eligibility Determination
6201300369	Management Class 2	6210500149	Management Class 2
6210500025	Management Class 2	6210500150	Management Class 2
6210500061	Management Class 2	6210500151	Management Class 2
6210500062	Management Class 2	6210500152	Management Class 2
6210500105	Management Class 2	6210500153	Management Class 2
6210500106	Management Class 2	6210500178	Management Class 2
6210500107	Management Class 2	6210500179	Management Class 2
6210500108	Management Class 2	6210500180	Management Class 2
6210500109	Management Class 2	6210500215	Management Class 2
6210500110	Management Class 2	6210500219	Management Class 2

6210500111	Management Class 2	6210500243	Management Class 2
6210500012	Management Class 2	6210500244	Management Class 2
6210500113	Management Class 2	6210500261	Management Class 2
6210500114	Management Class 2	6210500283	Management Class 2
6210500115	Management Class 2	6210500286	Management Class 2
6210500116	Management Class 2	6210500292	Management Class 2
6210500117	Management Class 2	6210500294	Management Class 2
6210500118	Management Class 2	6210500295	Management Class 2
6210500119	Management Class 2	6210500296	Management Class 1
6210500120	Management Class 2	6210500297	Management Class 2
6210500121	Management Class 2	6210500300	Management Class 1
6210500129	Management Class 2	6210500332	Management Class 2
6210500130	Management Class 2	6210500366	Management Class 2

Grazing activities have the potential to damage or destroy these sites directly and indirectly through the movement, concentrations and innate behavior of cattle. When range improvement projects or other associated projects (cattle management, riparian habitat restoration/protection/improvement, and wildlife/fisheries habitat protection/improvement) are proposed heritage program personnel will identify sites on the ground and will coordinate with appropriate project personnel to provide location information and additional protection mitigations as needed.

Cattle trailing between pastures would occur on pre-existing roadways. The permittee is reasonably required to keep the cattle within the disturbed road prism to avoid potential damage to heritage resources (particularly when trailing through Diamond City).

An Adaptive Management Strategy (AMS) is proposed under alternative D. Any project/treatment that results from the AMS would be subject to and comply with the NHPA Section 106 to ensure the protection of historic properties and traditional cultural resources.

By following the prescribed design criteria stated in chapter 2, alternative D will have no effect on heritage resources.

Management Class 1 Sites have been evaluated and determined not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Before any activity occurs at the sites, SHPO will review and need to concur with determinations. Management Class 1 sites will then not need to be actively managed.

Management Class 2 sites must be protected and preserved as if they were eligible for the NRHP. There are two protection options available. Either provisions must be made to avoid direct impacts to the site during the planned activities (e.g. delete or buffer entire unit or a sufficient amount of the unit to avoid impacts to the site) or, if it is determined this is not a viable option, a plan for site evaluation and effects mitigation must be developed and executed by the Forest or District Heritage Program. There are several mitigation options that can be explored including

research, interpretation, public education, site enhancement or a combination of these and other options. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurs with these actions.

Tribal Concerns: POTENTIAL TO AFFECT

The concerns raised by the tribe may not be resolved with regard to grazing activities within the parcels identified as potentially NRHP eligible Traditional Cultural Properties. Alternative A does not address tribal concerns, all the TCPs are included within the grazing allotment and would continue to be affected by grazing activities. Under alternative B no grazing would be allowed in the allotment which addresses the tribal concerns. Alternative C would reasonably address tribal concerns because the boundary modification excludes all four TCPs from the grazing allotment. Alternative D modifies the allotment boundary to exclude three of the TCPs from grazing, however one TCP remains within the grazing allotment and may be affected by grazing activities. Reasonable efforts would be made to prevent effects to the TCP but the potential to affect remains.

Adaptive Management Effects on Heritage Resources for Alternative C and D

The five potential adaptive management strategies for sensitive plants include:

1. Installing additional riparian exclosures, livestock watering structures.
2. Improving pasture controls.
3. Reducing livestock numbers.
4. Reducing grazing season.
5. Planting native vegetation.

The effects of each of these strategies would be beneficial and protect heritage resources affected by livestock grazing and decrease the rate of deterioration of heritage resources.

The other adaptive management strategies that could be used to reduce impacts on water quality, streambank integrity, or riparian shrub density including:

1. Installing additional riparian exclosures or other barriers,
2. Re-building/armoring livestock crossing/watering structures,
3. Installing additional livestock watering structures in uplands,
4. Improving pasture controls or livestock movement by installing more fence, using vegetative barriers, or installing more cattle guards, or
5. Planting native vegetation around riparian zones to shade stream and stabilize banks.

Prior to the implementation of any of these strategies the project and project location would be assessed by the forest archaeologist. Based upon the Programmatic Agreement Among the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding Cultural Resources Management on National Forest in the State of Washington (1997), there are provisions in place to

address specific activities associated with Ecology, Range, and Watershed and Fish and Wildlife. The Heritage Resources program will follow the guidance of the programmatic agreement when considering specific adaptive management projects.

Cumulative Effects (applies to all alternatives)

Cumulative effects projects can be generalized into five categories: timber/vegetation management activities, road maintenance activities, riparian/fish management activities, recreation, and utility transmission special uses permit activities.

Timber/vegetation management activities have the ability to open up the landscape (removal of natural barriers) so that cattle move across the landscape. This can also expose cultural resources that may have been previously protected by vegetative cover to ‘scratching’ and trampling.

Road maintenance activities typically do not affect cultural resources; roads tend to create an easier travel corridor for cattle and can reduce the effects of trampling. Road activities can have a positive effect on TCPs in that they allow tribal members and traditional practitioners’ access to TCPs while at the same time allowing access to other uses (OHV) that may not be compatible.

Riparian/fish management activities do not typically affect cultural resources and can on occasion provide additional protection to certain cultural site types (i.e. flumes, bridges, homesteads) through enclosure fencing. However, in the case of the proposed LeClerc Creek Dam Removal; the removal would have a direct, negative effect to at least one cultural resource and has the potential to affect other downstream sites if not mitigated appropriately.

Recreation activities in the project area include but are not limited to the following: dispersed camping, hunting, and OHV use. The activities in general have the potential the effect (i.e. looting, vandalism, and damage) heritage resources particularly to those resources that have increased visibility and user access. The OHV trails at Ballpark Meadow are located within an area known for its historic properties, however if the OHV use is restrained to the established trails there will be little to no effect to cultural resources. Recreation activities can have an effect on TCPs when those activities (OHV use) are incompatible.

Utility transmission transportation special uses permit typically do not affect cultural resources. Certain utility corridors allow for cattle movement and concentration typically removed from cultural resources. Utility transmission transportation special uses permit can have effects on some types of TCPs (culturally significant view-sheds).

The time bounding for cumulative effects encompasses previous and present disturbances from projects listed in the appendix and assumes disturbances from future projects. No other projects including the proposed action would have detrimental effects to historic resources or TCPs.

Historic Properties

Under Alternative A, Alternative C, and Alternative D; historic properties within the planning area would experience minimal effects from the cumulative projects in the area. Effects may include destruction or damage to sites due to cattle trailing, cattle concentrations, and cattle rubbing against historic structures. Certain cattle management techniques, such as, fencing and the maintenance of natural boundaries around sites would effectively reduce these possible impacts. Other projects proposed in the area would follow site-specific mitigations to avoid all known historic properties and to cease/desist work in locations of newly identified historic properties.

Under Alternative B, historic properties would experience a lesser degree of effect due to the removal of cattle grazing from the area.

Tribal Concerns

Under Alternative A, TCPs would experience some degree of effect due to the continuation of cattle grazing from the area. Effects may include destruction or damage to medicinal plant sites due to cattle trailing and cattle concentrations. Certain cattle management techniques, such as, fencing and the maintenance of natural boundaries around sites would effectively reduce these possible impacts.

Under Alternative B, Alternative C, and Alternative D; TCPs within the planning area would experience minimal effects from the culmination of projects in the area. Under Alternative B, Cattle would not be permitted in the allotment, thus reducing the tribal concerns. Alternative C proposes an allotment boundary change which would remove cattle from grazing, trailing, and/or concentrating in/near TCPs locations. Alternative D proposes an allotment boundary change which would remove cattle from grazing, trailing, and/or concentrating in/near all but one TCP location.

Future activities associated with the above alternatives within the planning area would have no foreseeable effects on the historic properties.

SITE-SPECIFIC MITIGATIONS

Projects proposed for range improvements, cattle management, riparian habitat improvement, wildlife and fisheries habitat improvement would require consultation with the Forest Archaeologist who would determine the need for cultural resource inventory. The Forest Archaeologist or qualified Heritage Program personnel would identify sites on the ground and would coordinate with appropriate project personnel to provide location information as well as any additional protection measures that may be required.

Cattle trailing between pastures would occur on pre-existing roadways. The permittee is reasonably required to keep the cattle within the disturbed road prism to avoid potential damage to heritage resources.

Forest Plan Compliance

The LeClerc Creek Grazing Allotment Planning EIS projects, with the mitigation provided, meets the Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Cultural Resources item 2 page 4-37 and Federal regulations concerning Heritage Properties (National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations at 36CFR800). Monitoring and maintenance of these sites will continue through the Heritage Program's standard program of work.

REGULATION COMPLIANCE

The LeClerc Creek Grazing Allotment Planning EA projects, with the mitigation provided, meets the Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines for Cultural Resources item 2 page 4-37 and Federal regulations concerning Heritage Properties (National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations at 36CFR800). Monitoring and maintenance of these sites will continue through the Heritage Program's standard program of work.

PREPARER/AUTHOR

Alicia D. Beat – Heritage Program Manager, Forest Archaeologist, and Tribal Relations Coordinator
Colville National Forest Supervisor's Office, Colville, WA
(BA, Sociology/Physical Anthropology – 1998; MA, Physical Anthropology – 2003)

/S/ Alicia D Beat

Alicia D. Beat, Forest Archaeologist

4/22/2015

Date

REFERENCES

- Bamonte, Tony and Suzanne Schaffer Bamonte
1996 *History of Pend Oreille County*. Tornado Creek Publications. Spokane, WA.
- Chance, David H.
1973 "Influences of the Hudson's Bay Company on the Native Cultures of the Colville District." *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes Memoir*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Part 2. University of Idaho, Moscow.
- Fandrich, Blaine
2002 *Pend Oreille River: An Evaluation of 23 Historic Sites Located Between Albeni Falls Dam and Box Canyon Dam*. EES Consulting Inc., Bellevue.

Kennedy, Dorothy and Randall T. Bouchard

- 1998 "Northern Okanagan, Lakes, and Colville." *Handbook of North American Indians-Plateau*. Volume 12. Smithsonian Institute, Washington D. C.

Lahren, Sylvester L.

- 1998 "Kalispel." *Handbook of North American Indians-Plateau*. Volume 12. Smithsonian Institute, Washington D. C.

Thoms, A. V.

- 1987 *Upland Land Use and the Initial Assessment of 45PO148: The Sullivan Lake Archaeological Project, Northeastern Washington*. Center of Northwest Anthropology, Washington State University, Pullman.

USDA Forest Service

- 2000 *Colville National Forest Plan*. USDA-Colville National Forest.